



PHILIP MORRIS

INCORPORATED

LAW DEPARTMENT
PATENT SECTION

P. O. BOX 26583, RICHMOND, VIRGINIA 23261

(804) 271-2822
TELEX 827339

April 3, 1980

George J. Brandt, Jr., Esq.
Watson Leavenworth Kelton & Taggart
100 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10017

RE: Smoking Article 582-765 W. Germany
Our file PM 588

Dear George:

Concerning the application of Hind and Hopkins for cigarette wrappers of pectin or gum, I shall try to comment on the "Comments on the Official Action" of March 13, 1980, from our agents in Germany, which discusses the requirements for deleting certain examples. Unfortunately the amended claims of August 4, 1975, are not in our files so that I can only guess as to their contents. Presumably the ranges, per 100 parts of polysaccharide, are:

1. for filler, 8 to 40 parts, and
2. for humectant, 2 to 40 parts (as in U.S. claims 4 and 7, respectively).

As they say, examples 4 through 6 have too little filler and unless the lower limit can be reduced to 5 or 1.8 parts/100, they must be deleted. Examples 1, 10, and 11 use cellulose derivatives, not cellulose. If methyl cellulose does not fall within the claim definition of polysaccharide, example 10 will have to go. Example 2 does not employ a humectant and will likewise have to be dropped. Example 3, like 5 and 6, uses too little filler. In examples 13 and 15, on the other hand, the proportions of humectant are 30 and 25, respectively, within the limits under (2) above. Example 21 will have to be cancelled. Propylene glycol is a humectant in example 16.

If you have further questions, call me.

Very truly yours,

George Esler Inskeep

bjd/GEI

2026515060